

1961

of the Republic of Korea. Thousands of American fighting men were killed or maimed in the Korean struggle.

RESOLUTION AWAITS ACTION

The Congress of the United States has gone on record in the past as being opposed to the recognition of Red China and against that Government's admission to the United Nations. It is about to do so again. A resolution to this effect has been introduced in the Senate by Senator DIRKSEN of Illinois, minority leader of the Senate. He has been joined in the sponsorship of this resolution by Senator MANSFIELD of Montana, the majority leader, and by several other Senators. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has as yet taken no action on the resolution, and Senator DIRKSEN has threatened to offer it as an amendment to the mutual security bill—the foreign aid bill—unless the resolution is reported out and the Senate given a chance to act upon it. The same committee is handling the foreign aid bill, and is expected to have that measure ready to send to the floor of the Senate by the end of this week or the first of next. In the House of Representatives, Republican Judd, of Minnesota, has introduced a similar resolution and it is before the House Foreign Affairs Committee which, too, has been working on the mutual aid bill.

There the resolution stands. That it would be overwhelmingly adopted in both Houses of Congress is the prediction of many observers. Meanwhile, it is reported that the White House—meaning the President—is getting opinions from the State Department and other sources regarding what should be the U.S. attitude when this question of taking up the admission of Red China to the U.N. is brought up in September in the General Assembly of that organization, as it seems certain it will be. The moratorium on discussion of the Chinese question, which this country and its supporters have been able to maintain for so long—despite the demands of Russia and its satellites—is threatened by some of the newly admitted African nations. The last vote in the Assembly was carried by the United States by a narrow margin, and statements by the "realists" in this country have not helped.

FIGHT THE ISSUE OUT

The Kennedy administration does not want the recognition and admission of Red China to the U.N., although there are "realists" in its midst. A strong vote in the Congress on the subject may be of assistance at this time and a notice to our friends in the U.N. that we intend to fight with vigor any move to bring Red China into the organization. In the meantime, however, there have been reports that this country might offer some plan to give Red China membership, but keep the Nationalist Chinese Government on Formosa still a member with membership on the Security Council. This has been denied, but apparently the administration is casting about for some plan to prevent a vote in the General Assembly to take up the Chinese issue. The better course would be to fight this issue out, and to attempt to rally all our friends. Britain has its own realists on the Chinese question, but she has stuck with us in the past loyally.

Being "realistic" too often in the past has proved no less than appeasement in the end. In the opinion of some, Woodrow Wilson was not "realistic" when he took us into war against the German military machine in 1917—unprepared as we were. Harry S. Truman was not being realistic when he told the Russian Communists to keep hands off Greece and Turkey, nor was Dwight D. Eisenhower being realistic when he told the Red Chinese we would defend Formosa and the Chinese Nationalists there from attack.

The difficulty today lies in the fact that our friends in Europe, in the Middle East, and the Far East are not sure how far we will go to back up our words and commitments. This is no time for the United States to be a nation of rabbits.

SOVIET WARPLANES ENTERING CUBA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it is now reliably reported here in Washington that Soviet Mig's have begun arriving in Cuba. It is also known that Cuban pilots have been receiving training in Mig's in Czechoslovakia. These Soviet-trained pilots, if not already back in Cuba, will be returning shortly. All of which poses a further serious problem for this country. It is time to make up our mind and for neighbors to make up theirs what they propose to do about Soviet-puppet Castro and the threat he represents to the whole Caribbean area and Latin America.

David Lawrence had an extremely important column on this problem in the Washington Star for July 11. I ask unanimous consent to have this column printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks for the benefit of those Senators and others who may want to read it.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET WARPLANES ENTERING CUBA—ACTION HELD DEFINITE ATTEMPT BY REPS TO SET UP MILITARY BASE IN HEMISPHERE

(By David Lawrence)

Authoritative information has been received here that Russian Mig's have been supplied to the Castro government in Cuba. The warplanes did not arrive in time to be of help to the Cuban dictator before the ill-fated invasion in the spring, but the presence today of Soviet war supplies is confirmed.

This step is one that has not been given any publicity. The reasons are not known. Those who do comment on it privately say the Cuban Government requested the munitions and theoretically is free to buy them from any country in the world.

But while, strictly speaking, any government may obtain aid from an ally, the United States does not recognize the right of any European power to gain a foothold in any country in this hemisphere. Originally known as the Monroe Doctrine, this principle has been adopted as part of the international law of this hemisphere by the other countries in Latin America.

What the United States now observes, therefore, is a definite attempt on the part of the Soviet Government to set up a military base in this hemisphere. The fact that this is being done in collaboration with an existing government does not alter the principle involved. Cuba is 90 miles away from the United States and a relatively short distance from other countries in Central and South America which have free governments.

For some strange reason, some of the Latin American Governments have been hesitant to come out forthrightly against the Soviet infiltration of this hemisphere. Yet, if any one of them got into trouble, it would be pleading with the United States for help. Unfortunately, the administration here has not crystallized its own Latin American policy except to announce just before the Cuban invasion that the United States would not intervene militarily. This was, unhappily, construed widely to mean that

under no circumstances would the Washington Government come to the assistance of a Latin American Government if it should be subverted or, indeed, seized by a foreign power and a puppet government established to carry on its diplomatic relations as well as other functions.

The Soviet scheme is to set up puppet governments everywhere. Moscow has done so in the Balkans. It is preparing to do so in other Latin American countries, as it has in Cuba.

So the concrete question which confronts the U.S. Government is whether a puppet government, established with the economic and military aid of a European power which now sends warplanes to such a country, should be ignored and no steps taken to combat the hostile influence which has been generated. Certainly the relations between the United States and Cuba have grown steadily worse under the inspiration of Soviet advisers who play a prominent part in the Cuban Government.

The basic fact is that Cuba today has a puppet government. There have been no elections to give the Cuban people a chance to express themselves. They have been enslaved through methods introduced by Soviet stooges who occupy "advisory" positions in the government at Havana. Thus, a police state, instead of a free government, prevails in Cuba.

The Kennedy administration has not yet made up its mind what its policy eventually will be in Cuba. But it is difficult to see how there could be a completely hands-off attitude while the Soviets quietly ship in more and more munitions of war to aid the Castro government. The Russian MIG's could at any moment pursue guerrilla tactics and damage American cities. The Russian Government naturally would disclaim all knowledge and all responsibility, and yet considerable injury might well be inflicted for which no recompense could be obtained.

The Cuban problem has been drifting along without any concrete action by the United States. The shipment of Russian MIG's to Cuba, however, accentuates the danger, and it is surprising that even in Congress so little attention is being paid to what is happening 90 miles away from the territory of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business?

A NATIONAL PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATING PRIMARY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently I appeared before Senator KEFAUVER's Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and submitted an amendment for a Presidential nominating primary. I feel very strongly that Americans are in part disenfranchised in virtually all of our States in the selection of the most important public official in America. They have a choice between only two men who have any chance of being elected President, and in most States they have almost nothing to say about who is to be nominated by the two parties.

A number of distinguished Presidents, including Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt, have favored the kind of proposal I have made. The Presidential primary is now strongly favored by Senator KEFAUVER, and Senators SMATHERS and SMITH of Maine have similar bills which they have introduced. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the hearing before the Kefauver subcommittee be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM PROXMIER, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Senator PROXMIER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, first let me thank you for giving me the opportunity to come before your subcommittee today. I speak now in support of a Constitutional amendment, which I have proposed, to establish a national presidential nominating primary.

The plain voter has no real chance to say who will be the only two men in the Nation with any chance to win the most powerful office in the free world—that is, the nominees of the Democratic and Republican parties in the Presidential election campaigns. Without that chance, what does democracy really mean?

Far less than it should.

In a democratic form of government such as ours it is the plain voter—and by this I mean all of the plain voters—who should have the right to say who should be their governing officials.

Surely in the choosing of the most important official in our Government, the President, the fullest possible participation by all voters should be at least legally possible. And this idea should apply particularly to the primary which narrows the selection process to the final choice of two.

Is it not a far better thing to choose our presidential nominees in a national primary, where the candidates and their ideas are on display and are contending openly, than it is to choose them in the narrow, emotional, cynical, rumor-filled, bandwagon rolling, shouting, no one-listening climate of a party convention?

Senator KEFAUVER. You should include the "smoke-filled room."

Senator PROXMIER. I will throw that one in too, and contrast the smoke-filled room and the noise and shouting and the emotional situation that we have at a convention with the quietness of the voting booth, in the voting places all over America where every voter has an opportunity. If only for a minute or so, to think quietly as to the candidate whom, in his judgment, is best qualified, and to do so without any pressure.

Are we not far better served, at this time in world history when our system is on trial, by placing our trust in all of the people, rather than in a partisan few. We now rely on a microscopic ratio of 1 unrepresentative, nonresponsible delegate to 20,000 potential voters to select the men who will contend for our most important office? What a vast increase in public interest and education in public issues would flow from these exciting contests. And how urgently that public interest and education is needed today in our democracy.

A great American President answered these questions in the affirmative nearly half a century ago. Woodrow Wilson came out strongly for a national primary in 1913, and support for the idea has been growing ever since. The idea for a national primary is not a new one.

As already has been indicated in his statement by the Assistant Attorney General, Robert La Follette, one of the greatest Senators who ever lived and perhaps the finest statesman that was ever developed in our State, was a real champion of grassroots democracy. And one of the principal methods of achieving grassroots democracy, in his judgment, was to have a Presidential primary.

Senator KEFAUVER. Then he was joined by Senator Norris at that time.

Senator PROXMIER. As I understand it, yes. Since the advent of national television coverage of the conventions, public opinion polls have reflected consistently the fact that the vast majority of the American electorate wants a more direct voice in the choice of its Presidential candidates.

In 1956, 58 percent of a national public opinion poll favored a national primary. National primary bills have been introduced in the past by the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, and by Senators SMATHERS, of Florida, and SMITH of Maine.

There are compelling reasons for the adoption of this amendment.

The key weakness lies in the fact that the rank and file of the parties' membership do not have a meaningful voice in the selection of the Presidential candidate.

Theoretically, the national convention is a democratic institution, but, in fact, it is not representative of the wishes of the rank and file of party members.

In the majority of our States, the delegates to the national conventions are chosen either by State conventions or by State party committees. A handful of political leaders can, and often does, dominate these conventions and committees.

Some kind of Presidential primary does exist in 15 of our States, but in most cases these primaries are not responsive instruments for carrying out the wishes of the mass of the party membership.

In a few of these States, the delegates are named by conventions and the presidential poll is only advisory. In some other States, delegates are elected by the people, but are not pledged to support any particular candidate. In a third group of States, delegates are pledged, but are allowed, under State law, to switch to other candidates at the convention, according to their own estimate of the chances of the various contenders.

My own State of Wisconsin is one of only a few where the delegates are bound to support the candidates who won the primary vote. There is no assurance, even in such States as these, that the names of all of the leading contenders will appear on the ballot.

The result of all this is a national convention which is guided mainly by a small group of political leaders who are motivated by what they conceive as being good for their party organizations, either at local, State, or national level. I can't emphasize this enough. What nominee would give the party the biggest boost in Wisconsin or Tennessee or Arizona becomes the criterion—not who is the best qualified candidate.

I want to take a minute to refer to the presentation just made by Assistant Attorney General Katzenbach a few minutes ago when he talked about the expense of conducting a national primary campaign. I think the expense would be less in a national primary, not more. It is necessary now under the present system for candidates to go into virtually every State, one way or another, in order to secure support. On the other hand in a national primary, held on the same day in the whole nation, national media which are far more efficient throughout the country could be utilized in all States at once. The campaign could be conducted far more efficiently than a campaign in which candidates have to go into State after State and use different methods and systems.

For this reason I think the expense might well be less. But I am disappointed there has not been a study to support the charge as made by the Assistant Attorney General that this would cost more.

I think that on the basis of the experience which the chairman has had, certainly as much as anyone active in public life today, the present system is enormously expensive.

Senator KEFAUVER. I want to say that I thoroughly agree with Senator PROXMIER about the expense. As a matter of fact, a candidate without financial means would have a much better opportunity of getting his message to the people by putting it on a nationwide primary held on the same day as under the present system.

Under the present system, as you say, you have to go to all of the States. And I think, as I said a few minutes ago, the cost in non-primary States of trying to get your delegates is much larger than where you have the opportunity of appealing directly to the people in the States.

I think this national primary system would encourage candidates who might be qualified but who do not have a lot of financial backing to participate. And I think it would be a good thing.

Senator PROXMIER. I agree with you. The fact is that when a man has built up an outstanding reputation as a Senator, as a Governor, as a fine administrator at the Cabinet level or as an outstanding businessman in private life, that this is a reputation that becomes a national reputation; and the national primary would enable people to run on the basis of their record and what they have established, rather than on their skill at manipulating the particular kind of political situation which existed in either a primary State or a convention State or a party committee State.

And I think it would minimize, there is no question about this—it would minimize the importance of partisan connections and associations with people who happen to be in power in particularly important States.

The second point made by Mr. Katzenbach was one in which he referred to Governor Stevenson and said that it would take too much time from their duties for candidates occupying important office. Anybody who looked at the record of candidates in the past—Senator Taft, who was, certainly, a brilliant and fine Senator, Senator Kennedy, who was also a splendid Senator—all of the candidates went all out to win this nomination and they served a wonderful purpose in doing so. They were absent a great deal in the past from their duties.

They brought their message to the people. And I think the most important function that a man in public life can perform is to go out to the people and argue his position and try to persuade them to follow wise and thoughtful national and international positions.

I am sure it takes time away from important duties, but I think that this is the most important time that a man can spend. So that I think to say that it would take time and detract from their duties is not a persuasive argument for two reasons: In the first place, the present system is extremely time consuming; and in the second place, I think that the time that would be taken under the new system would be time extremely well spent.

Senator KEFAUVER. Let me say that I think that the time argument is facetious. It seems to assume that under the present system you do not have to go into the non-primary States to campaign. I can speak by experience that you have to go there, in any event to do any good.

You not only have to go once but you have to go several times.

And in the nonprimary States you visit the States, certainly, before the delegates are elected, and after the delegates are elected